

Date: Mon, 21 Mar 94 04:30:09 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #145  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                  Mon, 21 Mar 94                  Volume 94 : Issue 145

Today's Topics:

    Coord. priority for open repeaters (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

---

Date: Sun, 20 Mar 94 16:57:47 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!rcanders@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Coord. priority for open repeaters  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2m5188\$lfn@network.ucsd.edu>,  
Brian Kantor <brian@nothing.ucsd.edu> wrote:  
>md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:  
>>Since the FCC recently said that repeater trustees can "ban" operators from  
>>using their machines, in effect the FCC has ruled that all repeaters are,  
>>in fact, "closed".  
>  
>This is not recent.  
>  
>This has ALWAYS been the case, ever since repeaters were recognized in  
>the USA amateur rules.  
>  
>What astonishes me is that there are actually hams out there who thought  
>it was ever any other way!  
>  
>You have NEVER had the automatic right to operate through any specific  
>repeater. It has ALWAYS been at the repeater licensee's discretion.

Yes, the repeater owner can turn his machine off. Otherwise you are claiming that no one can transmit without the repeaters owners permission, thereby limiting use to the repeater owner or his friends.

>  
>The recent FCC letter simply restates what has ALWAYS been the rule.  
>Whether you knew it or not is irrelevant.  
>

Rod  
N0NZO

--  
Rod Anderson | "I do not think the United States government  
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of  
Clinton, Gore | fanatics decided to kill themselves"  
gone in 3 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

---

Date: Sun, 20 Mar 94 14:04:03 -0500  
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa  
Subject: Coord. priority for open repeaters  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> writes:

>The statement by a couple of people here that coordinating bodies should  
>give preference to "open" machines is hence irrelevant, since there is  
>no such thing as an "open" machine. All machines are "closed", you operate  
>there purely by the generosity of the repeater trustee.

But there is STILL a difference -- in fact, though not in law -- between a machine that IS open to all users (while still reserving the right to lock out lids) and one, like yours, that is not.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

---

Date: Sun, 20 Mar 94 12:04:17 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!sgigate.sgi.com!olivea!news.bu.edu!  
noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2lppnr8\$rln@network.ucsd.edu>, <CMrLnt.15E@news.direct.net>, <CMrysw.LFy@ucdavis.edu>¢  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

Daniel D. Todd <ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu> writes:

> Brian, if you are a general or higher class Ham, you must know about  
> HF emergency equipment being the only communications left functional  
> following certain natural disasters.  
>  
>Cecil,  
> Could you please explain this.  
>

Hi Daniel, in general, (no pun intended) I would expect general or higher class hams to know that HF emergency equipment is often the only functional communications that reaches outside a natural disaster area. I did not imply that only general or higher class hams would know this. If you inferred that is what I meant, I suggest you study some logic theory. The statement "mammals are warm-blooded" does not imply that mammals are the only warm-blooded animals.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

---

Date: 20 Mar 94 22:04:55 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Xenon.Stanford.EDU!  
kaufman@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CMrLnt.15E@news.direct.net>, <CMrysw.LFy@ucdavis.edu>, <Bu9twBp.cecilmoores@delphi.com>  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <Bu9twBp.cecilmoores@delphi.com>,  
Cecil Moore <cecilmoores@delphi.com> wrote:

>Hi Daniel, in general, (no pun intended) I would expect general or higher  
>class hams to know that HF emergency equipment is often the only functional  
>communications that reaches outside a natural disaster area. I did not

Would you please define "often" in terms of the last 4 or 5 natural disasters that have taken place in the U.S.? Even in Mexico City, the Red Cross used Inmarsat rather than HF. (I restrict my question to the US, because you were referring to HF equipment installed at a US company for use after a natural disaster).

If you can find several natural disasters for which HF emergency equipment was the only functional communications to reach outside the natural disaster area (I will let you consider world-wide disasters for that), tell me how much of that traffic was handled via morse CW, and how much was handled via other modes (voice, packet, AMTOR, etc).

Don't buck the issue. You made the claim, back it up with citations.

>imply that only general or higher class hams would know this. If you inferred >that is what I meant, I suggest you study some logic theory. The statement >"mammals are warm-blooded" does not imply that mammals are the only warm->blooded animals.

As a "general or higher class ham" myself, I would not subscribe to your statement, whether you would expect me to or not. In general, (no pun intended) I would expect general or higher class hams to know that the state of the art of world coverage communications has advanced beyond CW. Even SAC shut down GiantTalk.

Marc Kaufman, WB6ECE

---

Date: 21 Mar 94 02:46:05 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!joejarre@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar11.235940.26309@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>, <2m1h76\$ob7@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <CMns68.n2o@world.std.com>  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

David R Tucker (drt@world.std.com) wrote:  
: Jim Reese (jreese@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:  
: : In article <1994Mar11.235940.26309@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
:  
: : I admit I'm a bit sensitive to this. When I was the 2 meter frequency  
: : coordinator for North Texas, the Texas VHF-FM Society was sued because of a  
: : decision I made regarding a dispute between two open repeaters. The dispute  
: : arose from a disagreement between the trustee of the repeater (whose call was  
: : on it) and the President of the club who ran the machine. The trustee never  
: : allowed his coordination to be transferred to the club. When a dispute arose,  
: : the trustee took his ball and went home. The club wanted the coordinator to  
: : give them control of the frequency. Unfortunately, I didn't have any grounds  
: : to do this and had to rule in favor of the trustee. I didn't want to do this,  
: : but the Texas VHF-FM Society rules were very clear. When the incident was  
: : reported in the newsletter of the Texas VHF-FM Society, the President of the  
: : club sued the society and its officers for libel and slander. The lawsuit

: : paralyzed the society for two years, and caused me to resign as frequency  
: : coordinator. It was the worst experience I've had in my 15 years as a ham.

: An eloquent, clear, and convincing argument that clubs really are  
: different entities from any of their members, that they have a  
: legitimate need for their own callsigns, and that the FCC should have  
: been issuing them all along.

: -drt

: -----  
: |David R. Tucker      KG2S                drt@world.std.com|  
: -----

-----  
Date: 21 Mar 94 03:02:28 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!joejarre@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar11.162937.12335@cs.brown.edu>, <CMKz3H.Jxr@news.direct.net>, <2m2f81\$c6f@hpbab.mentorg.com>  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

Hank Oredson (hanko@wv.mentorg.com) wrote:

: In article <CMKz3H.Jxr@news.direct.net>, nu7i@indirect.com (Darrell Shandrow)  
writes:

: |> Nobody's telling you that you must have your closed repeater on the ham  
: |> bands. If you must charge for use of your repeater then you ought to  
: |> shut down and move to the land mobile or similar services.  
: |> Yes, I do agree that those who use a repeater often ought to support the  
: |> club. However, I'd hate to see the day when somebody who has a low  
: |> income and a simple radio gets a license and then can't use any repeaters  
: |> because they are all closed. Anyone who wants a closed repeater is an  
: |> elitist! 73

: And pray tell what is wrong with being an "elitist"?

: Isn't that what ham radio is all about? "We" got the license, and so "we"  
: can do things that "they" who did not get the license cannot do.

: Or do you advocate issuing licenses to \*everyone\* no matter what  
: their qualifications might be? Doing so would avoid being "elitist".

: This "elitist" thing not so simple ...

: |> --  
: |> Darrell Shandrow at Arizona State University

: |> Member: National Federation of the Blind  
: |> "Proud, Angry, and Strong" -- quoted from Jennifer Restle  
: |> (The complete information access agenda - You print it you braille it too!)  
  
: --  
  
: Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics  
: Internet : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com  
: Amateur Radio: W0RLI@W0RLI.OR.USA.NOAM

---

Date: 21 Mar 94 05:57:12 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CMrLnt.15E@news.direct.net>, <CMrysw.LFy@ucdavis.edu>,  
<Bu9twBp.cecilmoo@delphi.com>  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

Cecil Moore (cecilmoo@delphi.com) wrote:

[I wrote:]  
:  
:  
:>  
:>Cecil,  
:> Could you please explain this.  
:  
:  
:  
Hi Daniel, in general, (no pun intended) I would expect general or higher  
class hams to know that HF emergency equipment is often the only functional  
that is what I meant, I suggest you study some logic theory. The statement  
: "mammals are warm-blooded" does not imply that mammals are the only warm-  
blooded animals.

When stated as you did, twice, the above seems to imply if and only if  
one is a general class amateur would one be expected to know that which  
follows. That is the common interpretation for an everyday arguement,  
the first post was not nearly as clear on this point as was the second.  
If you would like to apply logic in a classical manner putting your  
propositions in a logical format would prevent any misinterpretations.  
The only reason I asked for clarification is the tone of your earlier  
posts, wspecially as they pertained to tech. class licensees. Since It  
is clear the options were either that he was a general class or higher  
licensee or he was a tech or novice operator it would make no sense to  
argue that if he were in one of those catagories he would know a certain  
piece of information unless you meant to imply that if he fell into the  
other catagory he would not know that information. Anyway I only asked  
because I wasn't sure what you meant, now I'm fairly confident.

Thanks for the reply,

Dan

\*-----\*

\* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      \*

\*                      Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu      \*

\*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102      \*

\*                      Davis CA 95616      \*

\*-----\*

\* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any      \*

\* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is      \*

\* completely coincidental.      \*

\*-----\*

-----

Date: 21 Mar 94 03:29:07 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
joejarre@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar14.182516.8742@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.co,  
<CSLE87-170394072139@145.1.114.19>, <BQ5Mg1Y.edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:

: Karl Beckman <CSLE87> writes:

:

: >With all the various add-on CTCSS boards in today's market, there is no  
: >excuse short of blindness combined with fumblyfingers (no snide comments  
: >about my keyboard skills, please!) for not being able to coax a low  
: >pitched buzz out of your HT. Of course, you don't have to use CTCSS  
: >decode in the HT; at least that way you can hear the other repeater with  
: >whom you are interfering.

:

: But will they FIT in a Tempo S1? Or in a Kenwood TH-21AT (aside from Kenwood's  
: own unit)?

:

: As for cheap-@ss hams, seems to me the cheapest way to get on 2m (with new  
: gear) is to buy a "green dot" commercial HT and re-crystal it...

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #145

\*\*\*\*\*